

ILLUMINATING THE PRODUCTION CLUSTERS FROM PHILOSOPHY

Marsanasco, Ana María

Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina
amarsanasco@gmail.com

Reception date:04/15/12 - Approval date:05/29/12

ABSTRACT

In recent decades there has been observed in Argentina the development of associative structures characterized by the integration of business and non-business actors. As part of this process, production clusters emerge, and together, a theoretical framework that responds to the specific needs and demands of these organizations.

This body of theory, called traditional approach, gathers models and theories that establish the training and development of production clusters in Argentina. That is, is the dominant paradigm from which these organizations lights.

In this context, this paper presents the principles of the theory developed to understand the representations that corporate actors of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) build on the formation and morphology of the agglomerate comprising production, and their relationship with the generation of innovations. These principles include epistemological perspectives of Cornelius Castoriadis and Martin Heidegger.

KEYWORDS: Clusters Production; Castoriadis; Heidegger; Imagination; Innovation; Ontology.

INTRODUCTION

The test we propose in this exhibition is a critical and reflective analysis of what is known as the traditional approach. That is, the set of theoretical insights and models to study essentially followed the theme of the production clusters (PC), such as the theories and models of Christaller, Perroux, Hirschman, Porter, and Piorebelli and Rabellotti, among others.

“Visión de Futuro” Año 10, Volumen N°17, N° 2, Julio - Diciembre 2013

URL de la Revista: www.fce.unam.edu.ar/revistacientifica/

URL del Documento: http://revistacientifica.fce.unam.edu.ar/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=335&Itemid=72

ISSN 1668 – 8708 - Versión en Línea

ISSN 1669 – 7634- Versión Impresa

E-mail: revistacientifica@fce.unam.edu.ar

The formation of clusters in Argentina has its basis on this approach, which also determines the empirical research. Its guidelines are paradigms recognized that for decades have provided models to study problems and solutions to these organizations.

That was how, prior to glimpse the target of the investigation, we had an idea about what we intended to investigate: we were within the established paradigm in the context of all this proposed conceptual frameworks, research design. Then, to understand the scope and limitations of the paradigm from which we look at the PC, was unavoidable critically examine, prior to continue for another PC with the research program initially designed. Consequently, it was outlined an essentially heuristic method: formulate questions that open to understanding, reflection and identification of the research problem, which is present below.

DEVELOPMENT

1. Detection of the research problem

Problems are often the beginning of any investigation. Certainly, we could refer to a paragraph the problem identified, however, and enriching believe wiser to understand how they were originating and relating the ideas, describe how realities are detected, the result of this distinction, became problematic: it is presented as unknowns to answer.

During June 2010 was conducted a field research in the production metalworking cluster of Olavarria city, Buenos Aires. The cluster under study has been created with support from the Technology Fund (FONTAR) and its goal of training is associated with innovation activities.

The objectives of this study were as follows:

General Objective: to describe the knowledge management process in the PC under study.

Specific objectives:

- Analyze learning ability.
- Understanding the nature of knowledge generated by the group.

In order to realize these objectives, it has been defined and measured different variables, variables such as strategy, culture and learning styles, ie, at least a couple of companies differ significantly in their responses.

Such findings put under suspicion the traditional approach, ie the framework from which we had watched the PC and, mainly, to one of his hypothesis: homogeneity.

Hypothesis featuring the PC as homogeneous configurations, harmonic, without conflicts and provided with a clear and shared understanding of their operations by their actors.

Unquestionably, the research results refuted the hypothesis of homogeneity, however, we note that a single mature refutative case was insufficient to think about building a complementary theory, that is, a view from above in order to understand the results of the investigation.

Was performed, then, a literature review of different theoretical and empirical work. This provided similar conclusions about the limitations of the traditional approach to explain the unsuccessful cases of PC and recognize the existence of internal heterogeneities. In this sense, the work surveyed said the stakeholder access to flows of information and links, is unequal and heterogeneous. Some actors are more receptive to certain levels of available. Then, the analysis of the data revealed that there were significant differences in technological externalities.

Thus, it was found that from the established paradigm was not possible to explain the findings of field studies conducted in different parts of the world, there was a discrepancy between theory and observation.

On the basis of these considerations, the following question arose: why corporate actors construct different perspectives on the formation and morphology of the PC that integrate?

In the next section we expose the construction process and currents epistemological ratio selected in order to construct a particular view on production clusters.

2. The imaginary as interpretation of state actors

The question posed assumptions reveals a search. Adopt assumptions, make sense, justify position, are typically philosophical attitudes. Thus emerged the notion of back room as the back, what lies in building on the PC heterogeneous business actors.

In the construction of this, it was use the contributions of Cornelius Castoriadis and the design that offers the social imaginary term in his book *The imaginary institution of society*. The social imaginary is an expression used by the author to refer to social representations. In fact, he says, often what we call reality is the work of imagination. Let's see what it is.

The vision we usually build to explain the existence of institutions have economic and functional dye. Through this vision, says Castoriadis (2010), we explain the existence of the institution and its characteristics by the role it plays in society, and its economic role in the

social life as a whole. But this functionalist perspective is limited, not to describe or comprehend meanings that not only functionality beyond but, at the same time, the functionality has meanings that does not explain itself.

Portraying Castoriadis (2010), a society can not be reduced to fulfill a number of roles because it consistently defines both new ways of responding to their needs as new needs. ¿How does occur then institutions if functional not fully explained? Castoriadis (2010) responds that occurs in the symbolic. But warns that while the symbolic is the way to be the institution, it is not limited to it. Indeed, he continues, a given organization of the economy exists as a socially symbolic system sanctioned. Involves tying a symbol (a significant) about meanings (representations, orders, connotations to do or not to do, etc..) and claim them as such, that is, make this link more or less forced to society.

Then, the author sees a problem of historical meanings: the actual results of the historical action of men do not end up being those who had targeted its protagonists. This circumstance poses a central problem: these unexpected results have significance and are presented as consistent. Moreover, these meanings are not fully subject to the content they transmit, are in ideal structures which are peculiar: the symbolic. All that is presented is woven into a symbolic network. We find the symbolic in the language but also, he mentioned, we find it in the institutions. Each institution is a symbolic network that supervenes partly of symbols: the symbolism can not take their signs anywhere, nor any sign corresponds to take your stuff in what is already there (the historical), hence, its constitution is not free and seems to be entirely suitable for the operation of the real processes.

We stop. At this point it should be noted some issues. The sign is a dual reality, composed of the signifier (what we perceive) and meaning (what we decode). For example, before a railway crossing with low barrier (significant) it will decode risk because the train pass (meaning). The interpreter performs the action of decoding the sign once you understand its significance. When we analyze a sign we note their significant, ie their material, but this does not happen when we interpret a symbol because doing the material support moves to give the imaginary.

A symbolic network, following Castoriadis (2010), seems to be not sufficient to understand the institutions because this network, by definition, refers to something other than the symbolism. ¿What that refers? It refers to meanings that may correspond to the perceived, to the rational, or the imaginary.

In short, what Castoriadis is saying (2010) is that there are real issues that although the importance for the functioning of a society, have a dual reality: economic-functional perspective and the role of the imagination. Then, there is a reciprocal relationship between the symbolic and the imaginary: imaginary to the symbolic use both expressed as to derive from the virtual to whatever else but, conversely, the symbolic and the imaginary presupposes that recognizes the ability of see a thing which is not.

3. The imaginary in the interpretation of the actors of a production cluster

From Castoriadis approach (2010), is distinguished that in the imaginary society seeks the necessary to complement their order. It would, therefore, be possible to interpret that, as in the imaginary is something that can not be reduced to the functional and imaginary sense of what gives the real factors such importance, an PC actors can find in him a complement to the operation of the PC. In other words, in the search for an understanding of the operation of the PC the actors construct the imaginary, ie, the set of representations, meanings, symbols and concepts that are not functionally, but that underlie it.

Following this, has begun to show the problem of historical meanings pointing Castoriadis (2010): the actual results of operation of these organizational forms may be dissimilar to those agencies that had initially planned protagonists of their creation. But, from the traditional approach to PC, these unanticipated results are not significant and are not as consistent in the framework of the approach. When, in reality, they are relevant and consistent with the imagery of the PC business actors.

Castoriadis (2010), as we plan to do it ourselves but in the PC in the next section, gives prominence to the connotations within a society saying that throughout history the names of the communities did not simply denote them, but connotaron also. The analysis of the meanings leads the author to argue that they refer to symbolic representations as imaginary connotations. And each is valid and true to the subject, since that he constructs from himself from his imaginary. In another way, the meanings of entrepreneurs in an PC involving a subjectivity matrix which supports the social imaginary (symbolic representations) are insufficient to reveal the mode of being or sense of PC, because the construction of the symbols are not doing in total freedom.

The symbolism, as noted above, is taken from the historical meanings, and these, together with the joint action of the players in the PC, resulting in connections between signifiers and meanings that were not planned but, however, seem consistent, not by the

determinations of the symbolic, but for the imaginary component of all symbolism. Therefore, the vision of symbolism is only partially adequate to meet the actors are identified with the PC that integrate, will be necessary to take into account the imaginary.

So, the polysemy of meanings that the concept connotes production clusters is creating a set of imaginary actors. These imaginary, in turn, can not refer to something, that is, are meanings from which a multitude of things are represented, reflected and managed. And among them we are interested in detecting and knowing that impact those the innovation capacity of the PC.

I described so far, is not related to theoretical abstraction that distinguishes one aspect of the processes and the operation between firms of a PC, to study them in more depth. In this context, the theory can not conduct a revealing approach if agglomerated productive significance had not already arisen and not been implicitly established. From the question, pointing Castoriadis (2010), is not to invent new words for what we are here discussing, but rather to understand that what they embody is not identifiable by means of grammatical categories according to which we are accustomed to think. The imagery of an PC are not figures or forms, or concepts, they are based on the conditions and common guidelines as practicable and representable for its actors.

Thus, we recognize the inescapable importance of representations of the actors of a production cluster in its genesis training, and mainly, when addressing the development of the generation of innovations since the current view of the operation of the PC, which seems to tend to reduce the functional significance, is bounded.

In the imaginary mode would prove to be or the sense of an AP to the extent that it is about a building which neither reality or rationality, or the laws of symbolism can respond fully. We reflect on this issue in the next section.

4. Towards understanding the mode of Being of production clusters

All organizations at some point in their development attempt to answer fundamental questions: what is the nature of the organization?, Why they exist?, What we want the organization be in the future? These questions, of course ontological, are answered in the mission and vision statements. These statements define the identity of an organization as they become operational, ergo: the entire company knows them and identify with them.

¿What happens in the PC? There are several independent companies that make up, but when they agglomerate to achieve a common goal attempt turned into a unit. The

ontological question wording, particularly its operation, resulting in a more complex process, a process which takes place in the imagination of the actors.

We understand that the role of the imagination is to provide answers to ontological questions that reality or rationality can no contribute and, also, in PC would be plausible to meet a variety of responses. Then it could happen that the cluster is constituted by its activity emerge in fact answers to these questions, specific to each employer but not necessarily competing among business actors and non-business of the PC.

The PC could thus lead to a variety of meanings about themselves. And the same Castoriadis (2010), as noted in previous rows, attaches importance to the diversity of meaning for communities throughout history. Which would mean that the term PC not only expresses the associative form of the group but also evokes a meaning in its members. Meaning which is imaginary but, at the same time, mentions, "it is, takes weight and is embodied in the institution that places the community to exist ... that answers the question by his Being and his identity by referring to some symbols that bind to another reality "[Castoriadis, C., 2010, p. 236]⁽¹⁾.

Should pay attention to this. For the Greek philosopher's the Nation is the institution that materializes to give life to the community and to respond to the question of Being. And in the PC? In them, the Department of Small and Medium Enterprises and Regional Development (Sepyme) and FONTAR are the main institutions that perform the identification function. What is at issue here, obviously, is not the possibility of response of these agencies as to the meaning of the Being of the PC but, rather, the other reality that builds them, ergo: appearances.

We argue that, while it is true that these institutions relate such responses on the basis of projects submitted and in the exchange with business and non-business actors, and indicators (symbols for Castoriadis), there are also cases of agglomeration without success that present traditional approach as appearances or, if preferred, a different reality to the one built by entrepreneurs who make up the PC. And, above all, are these appearances that mask the issue of differences between imaginary meanings.

Clearly, what we question here is purely functionalist interpretation built on the operation of the PC. Understanding that the only approach that highlights the existence of the PC as their characteristics by the function they fulfill for the attempted development of SMEs and their role in regional production network; approach that seems not to recognize the importance of the imaginary and reduces PC to it, while intended to be a comprehensive

"Visión de Futuro" Año 10, Volumen N°17, N° 2, Julio - Diciembre 2013

URL de la Revista: www.fce.unam.edu.ar/revistacientifica/

URL del Documento: http://revistacientifica.fce.unam.edu.ar/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=335&Itemid=72

ISSN 1668 – 8708 - Versión en Línea

ISSN 1669 – 7634- Versión Impresa

E-mail: revistacientifica@fce.unam.edu.ar

understanding of this type of organizational structure from this view, when in fact it is limited since it can not describe or comprehend meanings they carry to functionality.

What we're trying to say is that an PC can not exist without a number of functions to be fulfilled, but its existence is not limited to this. As associative structure will have to invent and define ways of responding to their needs, as well as new needs.

We believe that at this point we could say that we have argued from what referential imaginary appreciate the approach of companies as participants in the PC. But this does not exhaust the matter conversely, it becomes suggestive. Certainly, we are in a deeper level of analysis and more complex.

Let's see. It has tried to show that the meanings involve subjectivity of the actors, subjectivity that rests, following Castoriadis (2010), in the imagination. Also is mentioned that the role of imaginary meanings is to answer ontological questions and thus reveal the way of Being or sense of PC. In short, any understanding of the meaning of an PC refers to the imaginary of the actors, in other words, the imaginary always refers to something else, this time, to the perception of the actors in the PC. Therefore, for our purposes, constitute a means of access to the real body, ie the PC-Being. In this sense, Castoriadis (2010) mentions that the answer to the question ¿why are imaginary meanings rather than nothing? refers to the same question. It quote:

"We will not respond to these questions (why, after all, are there significant? why is there something rather than nothing?), We fail to understand how he could never have "answer" which is not ipso facto an iteration of the question, but simply trying to clarify the situation in which we are and which is globally inispeccionable, when we learn that society is only as instituting and instituted, and that the institution is inconceivable without significance" [Castoriadis, C., 2010, p. 558]⁽²⁾.

The author, here, says the circular structure of understanding that, according to Vattimo (1996), is one of the most relevant theoretical core of the entire book of Heidegger Being and Time. We are going to deep in this core in the next section in which we will discuss the main ideas of Heidegger's thought about the question of the meaning of Being. Similarly, the extent of our discourse in this direction is not going in one direction, ie, having detected the research problem, which is essentially based on recall the imaginary not problematized the conception underlying the PC and its relationship to innovation, we can build a proper explanation from the point of view of a new ontological reformulation.

5. Why are productive clusters and not rather nothing?

In this section we propose to base the ontological nature of the imagery as a way to articulate an understanding of the PC by business actors.

The question mentioned on the title refers to the fundamental questions of metaphysics. Martin Heidegger takes up the question of Leibniz: why is there an organism and not nothing?. The German philosopher says, in the first part of his book *Being and Time*, that this question of the meaning of Being is not only not been resolved, nor sufficiently raised, but has been forgotten. The man has been gradually forgetting their existential content, leading to the fall of the Self and its abandonment.

Heidegger made an ontology that differentiates the Being from the organizations. The error of metaphysics, thinks, is confusion between Being and beings: there is an ontological difference between them that should be the basis of metaphysics. However, although the ontological difference is not to be confused with the entity, the way we have to approach the understanding of Being is, precisely, through one of the entities: the Dasein, the Being who is in the world.

According to Heidegger (1927), the entity that question about Being is Dasein (man, in accordance with the use of the term that Vattimo made) this term is the meaning of existence (transcendence) located (in the world), Being-there: be there, in the world. The there for Dasein is the world. Heidegger (1927) wondered why the man has forgotten the Being, and answers that men to weigh the authorities have focused on the ownership of things and have forgotten the Being.

The entities or things, according to Heidegger (1927), unlike Dasein, are not animated in existence. They are referential entities, ergo: dependent on man projects. Things do not have Being, are entities that only gain importance when a Dasein project incorporates them.

While the essence of Dasein lies in its existence. As follow:

"The remarkable characters in this body are, therefore, properties that are there (...) but always ways to be possible for him, and only that (...) Therefore the term Dasein which we designate to this entity, not expresses the Why, as a table, house, tree, but expresses the being" [Heidegger, M., 1927, p.51]⁽³⁾.

That things are instruments, says Vattimo (1996), does not mean that all are means use effectively by Dasein, but authorities are equipped man some significance. Things are given to Dasein provided with a function, giving them a first function is a way to give them a

meaning: the meaning of useful. And entities appear as things only if they inserted in a totality of meanings of which man already has.

Precisely, we think that here starts the idea of circular understanding referred in the previous paragraph: the world appears to us only to the extent that we have some heritage of ideas and prejudices, says Vattimo (1996), which guide us in the discovery of things.

Thus, Dasein is thrown into the world to its possibilities because the man, to the German philosopher, is actually, understood as possibility, not merely a factual existence. So, for example, a table is because it can never be anything other than a table, but men are not-because we cast our chances and they are us. Let mention what Heidegger says:

"Dasein is getting his chance, and has not only the manner of a property that was there. And because Dasein is essentially becoming its possibility, this entity can in his being be chosen, earning himself, may be lost, ie not ever win or earn only apparently" [Heidegger, M., 1927, p. 52]⁽⁴⁾.

Now, there is a possibility that is present in each and every one of man's possibilities: the possibility of dying. Says Vattimo (1996): "Death is the possibility of the impossibility of any other possibility" [Vattimo, G., 1996, p. 48]⁽⁵⁾. Dasein is a being open to its possibilities but death is present in all others.

What Heidegger is saying (1927) is that the man is a metaphysical being: goes beyond the physical, of all things, meta (transcends) its factual presence. It is the only one wondering about the meaning of their existence and lives knowing he will die. Given this power-being, be unto death Dasein anxious distress and becomes aware of his finitude. Anxiety reveals to man his finitude in the world, ie anything that can prove to be nothing. The death experience is the experience of nothing. Heidegger says:

"Anxiety does not see a particular here or there since that could close as threatening. The to-do of anxiety is characterized by the fact that it is not threatening anything. Anxiety does not know what is what they will be trouble" [Heidegger, M., 1927, p.187]⁽⁶⁾.

¿Where do we go from here? Man to face his finitude seeks to transcend himself and is this anticipated(is) to death which raises the temporality of Dasein. ¿How seeks to transcend the man? Through art, painting, philosophy, and all other expressions that contain the idea that "man is something that tends beyond himself" [Heidegger, M., 1927, p. 58]⁽⁷⁾.

Now, when we say all other expressions, then, are we not also including organizations?, in other words, do organizations are also an expression of transcendence sought by man upon taking finite existence? The answer, we think, it should not be investigated in organizational definitions made by management theorists. From our view, we believe more revealing to refer to the back of ontological question.

Let's see. We asked a question in which we question whether organizations are a form of transcendence of man. The post in question here is Being of organizations transcendence. It follows that the Being of the organization is not herself. We're questioning the organization against its Being, and, as Heidegger says (1927): "Being is in the fact that something is and its Being-there, in reality, in the being-there, in the consistency, the validity, in the existence [Dasein], in the there" [Heidegger, M., 1927, p. 17]⁽⁸⁾. This means that Dasein establishes the relationships in the world. Man is the human being that when relate things assigned meaning. Man projects are those that give meaning and importance to things in the world.

So, if organizations are presented as a form of transcendence of men, also arise the question about the Being of the organization, the issue at hand, the PC-Being: PC-Being, ie the question of what is the meaning of PC-Being. But this question should be asked from any human being. According to Heidegger (1927), is the Dasein who presents the problem of Being as, for our investigation are the PC business actors. ¿Why do we dare to set this image? Why are entrepreneurs those who, like Dasein (or as such), wonder about the Being, that is, for the purposes of which PC are part. The question that arises then: why agglomerated productive exist?

This question also is formulated in time: Dasein is historical. Which temporalizes the question of Being. Heidegger expresses:

"That where Dasein implicitly understands and interprets what we call the Being, is time. The time should be brought to light and must be conceived as the genuinely horizon comprehension of Being and of every mode of interpretation. To understand this requires an explanation of the time originally as the horizon of understanding of Being from the temporality of Dasein as Being compressor of being" [Heidegger, M., 1937, p. 28]⁽⁹⁾.

Time becomes the transcendental horizon of comprehension and interpretation of Being. We are going to return to this issue shortly.

In this research we join the concepts of Being and Time, and corporate actors are those who bind PC: Being-PC arises because these actors are asking for it, ie no question of

Being as there are actors. As these historical actors (such as Dasein), also, temporalizes the question of Being, leading to the concept of time.

In sum, we believe that the formulation of the question of PC-Being gives us the guiding research proposed here as an ontological possibility. This question is involved in the understanding of Dasein because, following Heidegger (1927), understanding, and openness of the world, always concerns the whole being-in-the-world. This means that for an organization to ask the question of your being previously must have understood what it is to be interpreted.

Let's pause here and reflect on the above: the rise of the question by the PC Being, the Being is visible in its temporary: the PC in the beginning is a project of transcendence referenced to its members but, at some point in this temporality, assumes a state organization as non-subject existential; that is, according to our interpretation, the organization in the course of time apart of being a project reference to its members, begins to have existence independently of them. Similarly, by similar reasoning, we understand that the organization as non-subject will find its significance, ie begin to develop strategies, business, customers, alliances, and other organizational expressions that enable the idea that she extending in time.

The thesis that we are introducing here argues that organizations as entities arising from the interpretation of the Being of man and then evolve as a non-subject. We formulate the concept of non-subject to refer to the organization as a result of their development begins to take existence independently of the existence of its members. By the way and supporting this idea, if an organization is able to learn independently of its members (such as point various theories of organizational knowledge) creates visions, values, concepts and developments that tend to remain themselves independently of ingress and egress of its members, just as the above so far allows us to think that the organization is a means of transcendence of Dasein which then develops as a non-subject. This is because we believe that, apart from the interpretation of Being in each Dasein, there is a sort of social interpretation of Being: society impose against the organization actions to members. It is society that depersonalized men, interprets them as entities and at the same time, customize and gives life to the organization.

It would be possible, then, to think that the power-being of an organization as nonsubject reveals, in turn, a social reality. It is society that when forget the transcendent and concentrate on the domain of things, reifying, also, to mens, in this case, members of the

organization, does not distinguish between entity and men, granting the organization existence and transcendence.

Then, when an organization asks and answers the ontological questions (remember what we mentioned about the mission and vision) declares the meaning and ultimate purpose of itself. These statements will be visible on the timing. We mentioned earlier in back pages but we say again: Dasein to face his finitude raises this temporality, therefore, we think that the mission and vision statements ultimately reveal the assumption of finiteness by business actors and by analogy, the PC itself. This, to take an existential state of nonsubject, has a finite existence. And this existence, this mode of the PC in the world, can be authentic or inauthentic.

An inauthentic existence would not contemplate closing, the business completion; possibility that habits while all other possibilities of the PC or, habits all possible scenarios. That is, the death of the agglomerate is a possibility that would be part of the scenarios that members independently plan them take it, that is, they become aware of it.

At first glance, it might seem that the interpretations outlined in this exhibition to enlighten the PC through the thought of Martin Heidegger and Cornelius Castoriadis, is presented as one of those problems whose solution provides the merit of shedding light on theoretical questions and clarify ideas. If so, equally, we were greatly pleased. However, with knowledge appreciating the subject, we see that also carries practical significance. Thus, the change in perspective in light of ontological debate generates important consequences for the way of understanding this kind of partnership structures, investigate the characteristics and generation of innovations, as it involves understanding from its main protagonists and implies a significant relevance in the field of SMEs. The presented below.

6. Heidegger's thought in the context of SMEs and production clusters

According to the Argentina Association for Development of Small and Medium Enterprises, only 7% of the enterprises reaches the second year of life, and only 3% of them reached the fifth year of existence. In addition, 80% of SMEs fail within five years. As can be seen, the death rates of SMEs are very high.

Given this fact, the interpretations are different. In general we can bifurcate between the perspectives of corporate and non-corporate business actors, ie representations expressed through the views of both employers as analysts or theorists.

From the imaginary constructed by the first group, SME forums and business meetings reveal that Argentine SMEs owners attribute the cause of failure to external forces companies, ie economical, political and social context of business, such as difficulties: in accessing funding sources, excessive government controls, high taxes, high cost of available funding sources, and others.

However, while admitting the existence of all these problems, the question inevitably arises: ¿why, despite facing the same problem, some SMEs survive, progress and grow? Thus appears the focus of analysts. Those who tend to target the causes of failure in their own SMEs and, in particular, in the management capabilities of their owners.

Now, we propose to think by analogy with Heidegger thought that: if the organization is delivered to the world, just as Dasein but as non-subject, becomes one more in the market, and so would denying all decisions the possibility of his death. From this denial SMEs often build a vision definitely local, domestic and low awareness of stakeholders of the company and often have deficiencies in production processes and management.

The traditional approach maintains that the training of PC of SMEs contributes greatly to overcome these shortcomings by SME entrepreneurs. But behind the need for training in business management that may require their owners, underlies the meaning of Being of the PC, ie, the question of Being: the importance enclosing a unanimous understanding of business sense, ergo: the sense of Being-PC in order to circumvent these capital obstacles and detect further training needs. We will base this statement during the development of the following paragraphs. However, before it can be helpful to illustrate what we are playing with some examples.

Let then the first one. The first ideas that eventually led to the thoughts here dumps began to project into the Cafe Martinez of the corner of Mendoza and Cuba streets. The frequency of concurrency allows memory to remember the principles of this company. Suppose that Heidegger (hypothetically) out for coffee during a visit there and observe the principles displayed on one wall of the room. We believe that reading would give answer to the question: Why exist Café Martinez? The same would be: because we create flavors, moments and projects for a better life.

To our amazement, organizations often use the verb Be in the declaration of their views, for example, Café Martinez states that in a possible future (vision idea) wants to be in every country, city, town or district the place chosen by its people. This may indicate then that if today the company makes a statement about their future Being is because currently

there is not that Being, so: the organization is looking to be another, and in consequence and as we think in back pages, the organization is a non-is and is thrown their possibilities and these constitute as non-subject. We note, in this way, the empirical manifestation of the interpretation of Heidegger (1927): Being is not Being-there, ie the Being of the organization is not the organization.

Let us now turn to the second example: the Olavarria metalworking cluster. The group in its official website states as his reason of Being the developing partnerships between cluster members to improve the competitiveness of each of the member companies. Meanwhile, the FONTAR in the paper about PROJECT PI-TEC NA 012/06 states that the mission of this cluster is to integrate, share knowledge and experiences in order to achieve the necessary synergy to be market leaders in solids treatment. Product development of innovative separation of micro particles for domestic and regional levels to be used by various industries (paints, abrasives, mining, food, ceramics, etc.).

As can be seen, the discrepancies between the two statements reveal different representations on the target cluster. What is stated in the website by business actors suggests the development of cooperative ties for competitive improvement of each signature, ie, from our point of view, it would be possible for players to glimpse PC association not as a means to achieve a collective target. Perspective that, certainly does distinguish the FONTAR. Indeed, as stated by this organism, however, refers to integration, a knowledge sharing to achieve as cluster the project based in innovation.

These statements show the heterogeneities already mentioned. And, also, lead us to believe the possibility that the PC Being as non-subject is not equal to its actors than for FONTAR and, moreover, be dissimilar among the same actors in the cluster. It clear that the problem we have been disarmed in this research refers not only imagined but also ontological and existential.

If in the introduction of this section you were wondering what is all the paraphernalia of Being and Being-there, we hopefully having responded with seated. We looked at the PC through the thought that Heidegger embodied in Being and Time, and through him we understood various issues. On one hand, the question of the meaning of Being and answer is the back room of the fundamental concepts of mission and vision in which the Administration Theory is based to start looking from above (like all theories), in the organizations. And on the other, gave us a glimpse from an ontological perspective the relevance of these concepts, understanding that an organization that has dissimilar

responses to the question about the meaning of your Being, as Heidegger (1927), among its possibilities may not ever win or just earning apparently in other words, surrender to the world of the anonymous and live in a state of interpreted, by whom?, by the dominant discourse.

We want to clarify here that we are not taking sides on whether these discrepancies are in themselves good or bad. We are actually pointing out that in a society of organizations not know clearly the direction of the organization (forget his Being and granted inauthentic existence) carries the risk of leading to failure. And, in the case of SMEs this risk is very high.

The conclusion is clear: since the PC begins to form a sense of your being is somehow available to its players, because is not possible to be part of something without understanding minimally its meaning (the rules game) and, necessarily, from the search for understanding of the operations of the imagination group builds on the PC and the ontological questions are formulated. The problem arises because the mode-of-being of PC presents discrepancies between his actors and agencies that make feasible its origin and development, as we have pointed out pages ago: know the rules of the game is not the same as understanding the game. This means that the AP is presented as organizational structures that favor the origin of innovation processes and, ideally, they are, but appearances become relevant because emerging cases showing a different reality regarding the projected one. The appearance-reality problem, in our view, emerges from various issues summarized as follows: 1) partial supervenience innovation genesis in the notion of learning ability, and 2) the ontological backroom which underlies the problem detected and the imagination of the actors. Thematic that led us to redefine the research program to the PC analysis as they are. And in this redefinition, following to the German master, we place the question of the Being of the PC in their business actors as human beings who wonder why there is a PC. And indeed, this question becomes at Mission and Vision statements of organizations. The present the problem of PC led us to the question of what is the meaning of his Being and in the path of understanding Heidegger's thought has led us.

CONCLUSION

In this section, in conclusion, we will focus on establishing the limits and scope of this disclosure.

As we advance in the introduction, our purpose in this research is to present the epistemological guidelines of the theory built for understanding the relationship between the representations and business actors (imaginary) with the innovation capacity of particleboard production.

Linked to this, and also as a result, we wanted to present a critique of the traditional approach of clusters. Our criticism was mostly directed to one of their hypotheses: the hypothesis of homogeneity. And, as a result of deciding to have exhibited their abandonment by detailed reasons for this, we developed a heuristic approach to respond to the problem identified. That is, it was not our intention to show, and therefore should not be concluded from this study, that from the traditional theoretical corpus clusters, nothing works. Theories, according to which we adhere epistemological, are not total institutions.

Then, as a way to articulate an understanding of the business of a PC, we ask the question about the meaning of the Being of clusters and assume that corporate actors are those who have the problem of Being. Added to that, if the actors are developed in a historical context, the question is temporalizes and this temporary arises the non-state subject according to which organizations, in general, and PC, in particular, besides being a project transcendence of men begin to assume existence independent of them.

This idea, which we did ours, yields another way to look at the PC. Proposes argue that power-being of an organization as non-subject reveals a social reality.

As a result of the foregoing, we do not believe that this is the end of history, however, to paraphrase Mario Bunge, only those who can see, will find what further research is needed, and we look forward to continuing this work convene investigating philosophical perspectives seek another look at the issue of clusters.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- (1) CASTORIADIS, C. (2010). La institución imaginaria de la sociedad: el imaginario social y la institución. Buenos Aires, Tusquets, p. 236.
- (2) CASTORIADIS, C. (2010). La institución imaginaria de la sociedad: el imaginario social y la institución. Buenos Aires, Tusquets, p. 558.
- (3) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Escuela de Filosofía Universidad ARCIS. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 51.

- (4) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Escuela de Filosofía Universidad ARCIS. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 52.
- (5) VATTIMO, G. (1996). Introducción a Heidegger. Barcelona, Gedisa, p. 48.
- (6) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 187.
- (7) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Escuela de Filosofía Universidad ARCIS. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 58.
- (8) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Escuela de Filosofía Universidad ARCIS. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 17.
- (9) HEIDEGGER, M. (1927). Ser y Tiempo. Escuela de Filosofía Universidad ARCIS. Disponible en: www.philosophia.cl [consultada el 12/07/2010], p. 28.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Please refer to articles Spanish Bibliography.